



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

these hating nations actually join in a real operation to promote their common business? Does this international crime exist?

In March, 1913, the German Reichstag exposed the existence of a war trust composed of German, Austrian, and Belgian firms for the sale of repeating rifles in Russia, China, and other countries. They discovered that officials of their war department had been bribed by a member of that trust—the Krupp Gun Company. These officials were arrested and tried. Some were found guilty, some dismissed, and some imprisoned. Among those imprisoned was the secretary to the German Minister of War.

The German Weapon and Munitions Company of Dresden, making guns for Germany, holds leading shares in three French companies in Paris, thus stimulating France to build great armaments to match Germany.

The Noble Dynamite Company of England has fourteen directors, eight of them Englishmen and six of them German. They hold the majority of stock of four companies in England now working night and day to make dynamite with which Englishmen are to blow Germans to atoms; and they own large interests in four companies in Germany now working day and night to make dynamite with which Germans are to blow Englishmen to atoms.

Finally, the Harvey United Steel Company operated from 1901 to 1912 with its capital stock held as follows:

10,000 shares were held in six English war companies.
12,000 shares were held in five French war companies.
7,500 shares were held in two German firms, one of them Krupp.
8,000 shares were held by an Italian firm.
4,301 shares were held by an American firm.
6,000 shares were held by an English banker.
3,000 shares were held by a French banker.
300 shares were held by a German banker.

Each of these eighteen firms and banks was represented in the management by one or more directors, who sat in council to push the general business of all. That is the outside influence on every vote, on every war bill, in every nation of the world! That is the body of the Beast of War!

In times of peace, when men were singing in the fields, it raised the war scare. Each arm in turn held high its hand full of ships and guns and men. Then each other arm at once took into its hand more ships and guns and men. Thus for forty years the Beast played before the very eyes of us all—until its huge arms lay black and fearful across all the nations of Europe.

Then one day the Beast went mad. With one frightful claw unsheathed far into the breast of Germany, another sunk deep into the heart of France; with one tearing the vitals from Great Britain, another choking the throat of struggling Austria; with one ripping the body of giant Russia, another grinding the face of tiny Belgium—the War Beast now roars with glee as it smashes the nations together in earth and sea and sky.

If there be no death for this Beast, there is no hope for civilization. There is a death. The governments can purge the earth of this evil if each will take over in its own land every shop that makes a war gun and every dock that builds a warship; and then will reduce its armaments to the sensible needs of the nation, not again to be swollen and controlled by the money-lust of men.

When this war ends, as some day it must end, and the councilors gather together, as some day they must gather, to lay down the principles of peace, the first suggestion will be to reduce and regulate armaments. The Krupps will be there from Germany, the Creuseots will be there from France, and the Armstrongs and Whitworths will be there from England to protect—what? Their private business interests! Now, if nations are civilized, private interests will have no hearing. No matter how many factories may stand idle forever; no matter how many men must readjust themselves anew to life; no matter how great the economic losses may seem to be, these considerations can never measure against making an end of war. The cost of the first year of this war would have bought every share of stock of every great war factory in the world and indemnified every laborer for his idleness for the remainder of his life.

When this war is over there will have been left slaughtered and horribly buried upon the battlefields and under the seas of Europe; broken, distorted, and unrecognizable in the hospitals of Europe; wild and raging in the asylums of Europe, more young men than have lived by war works since war works began. That is an economic loss beyond redemption; that is a human sacrifice beyond atonement!

Is the moral force of our civilization equal to this moral task? Will the money-love of men again prevail? Or will the cause of the common welfare of the race rise triumphant? The answers to these questions will measure the hope of the new peace.

Are mothers to give the babies from their breasts, fathers the sons from their sides, forever, for the red feathers these war works enable them to wear?

MILITARY TRAINING IN SCHOOLS: TWELVE OBJECTIONS

By ROBERT CROMWELL ROOT

1. The school courses are already too full; therefore no other course should be added. This objection is sustained by Prof. John Dewey, of Columbia University, one of America's highest educational authorities.

2. Military training has not enough educational value to replace any subject that rightfully belongs in the school courses of study. This objection is upheld by Prof. John Dewey; President Henry Churchill King, of Oberlin College; ex-President Charles W. Eliot, of Harvard University; ex-Governor Charles E. Hughes, now of the United States Supreme Court, and Gen. John W. Foster, ex-Secretary of State.

3. The supposed benefits of military training can be secured more effectively by other means: the gymnasium and outdoor games and athletics. This statement is supported by such expert testimony as that of Dr. Dudley Sargent, head of the Hemenway Gymnasium, Harvard University; ex-President Eliot; Professor Reichart, of the University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Nathan C. Schaeffer, State Superintendent of Schools of Pennsylvania, and by Prof. Charles Zueblin, President King, Professor Dewey, Prof. Samuel T. Dutton, of Teachers' College, Columbia University. Moreover, the supposed benefits of military drill are due not to the system, but to the personality of the particular instructors.

4. The regulations generally, if not invariably, used

in military drill were prepared for adults and not for boys. The California law of 1915 states that U. S. Army regulations are to be used in drilling high-school cadets. This is manifestly an absurd requirement. Furthermore, teachers who have had experience in military schools tell me that the boys often resort to deception and outright lying in order to avoid the harsh punishment inflicted for violation of the strict military discipline. Moreover, actual tests show that the boy who begins target practice early in his teens so affects his muscles that he is inferior in accurate shooting to the one who begins target practice in maturer years.

5. The girls, even more than the boys, need the physical development supposed to be derived from military training; but the system thus far in use wholly ignores this greater need of the girls.

6. For all except a few officers in command, military training develops a blind, unthinking obedience. "Their's not to reason why, Their's but to do and die"—pitiable "Six Hundred"! For the rank and file, military training represses individuality (ex-President Charles W. Eliot) and self-initiative (H. Carrington, *Review of Reviews*, February, 1916, pp. 234-235) in the boys at the very time these qualities should be developed. Hence, for the rank and file, military drill prepares the boys to be mere imitators and automatons instead of self-reliant leaders of their fellow-men. Since military training, as the authorities quoted state, has not enough educational value to replace any other subject, and since the supposed benefits may be more effectively secured by other accessible, practical means, and since one-half of the school population is wholly ignored by this system, it therefore seems to be perfectly clear that the actual value of military training is practically nil and should have no place in our school courses (Dr. Nathan C. Schaeffer). Years ago English schools tried military training, and, finding it physically harmful, gave it up.

7. To adopt military training in our schools would be contrary to our national traditions and national ideals; therefore it would be undemocratic and un-American. It would out-Prussianize Prussia, for neither the Prussians nor Germans have as yet been so steeped in militarism as to burden their regular schools with military training (Prof. John Dewey, Dr. Nathan Schaeffer, and Dr. John H. Finley, Commissioner of Education of New York State).

8. To establish military drill in our schools would, in the boys' minds, place the emphasis on might and not on right. It would very strongly imply that might should be the first instead of the last line of defense. The writer has seen proof of this in pupils now taking military training in certain California schools.

9. Military training in the public schools fosters a spirit of suspicion and distrust of other nations. Acting on the fictitious plea of "national necessity," a "national enemy" must be found. This engenders international hatred—a long step toward war (Dr. Nathan C. Schaeffer, Professor Reichart, Dr. John H. Finley).

10. Military training in the public schools is not necessary in order to teach patriotism or to provide for national defense. Military drill may lead to efficiency on the parade ground or to skill at target practice, but it does not necessarily develop the spirit of patriotism. Real patriotism is of the spirit—of qualities of mind and

heart; hence it is not acquired by evolutions on the drill ground or by shooting at a target. True patriotism grows out of character. It requires a patriot to live a clean, strong life for his country quite as much as it requires one to be ready to die in defense of his country. "We can no longer look to war for the development of either national or individual character" (Justice Charles E. Hughes). The past experience of England, Germany, and the United States, not to mention other countries, shows how unnecessary and foolish is the plea for military drill in our public schools on the ground of "national defense" ("National Preparedness Facts," by Hon. Claude Kitchin).

11. The moral danger. The laws of the community and of the State forbid the boy to carry arms. He knows that the man who assaults his fellow-man with a deadly weapon is tried in court for his liberty or his life. He goes to Sunday school and learns the command: "Thou shalt not kill." He attends church and hears that he "must do unto others as he would have others do to him," and then he joins the cadet corps and is trained with gun and sword in the art of killing his fellow-men! Then we wonder why our boys have such hazy ideas on moral questions! We wonder why our boys are so often lacking in clear vision, clear reasoning, and right action (Prof. G. M. Stratton, Professor of Psychology, University of California, in the "Double Standard in Regard to Fighting").

12. The school system and the war system have nothing in common. We should be unalterably opposed to military drill in our public schools because it would join in close partnership the finest thing that American civilization has given to humanity—our free public schools, the hope of democracy—with war, the most barbaric, inhuman, and un-Christian system ever inflicted upon a struggling world.

Let us teach our boys that law and order must replace war, and the "Golden Rule" replace the law of hate and martial conflict.

A DAY AT ST. STEPHEN'S

By H. P.

UNDER the shadow of Big Ben, and quite near to the Abbey, within a stone's throw of the Home Office and almost next door to Scotland Yard, stands St. Stephen's House. The words, "St. Stephen's, Westminster," mean much to the lover of English history, and possibly "St. Stephen's House, Westminster," may find special significance in times to come in the history of international relations. For it is here that the Friends' Emergency Committee has its headquarters, and it is here that day after day ever since the beginning of the war, a never-ending stream of our so-called "alien enemies" have come. Each brings varying needs that have been met with food, clothing, money, or advice, and, above all, sympathy, which has seemed to be the most valued of all.

It was in August, 1914, within two days of the outbreak of war, that the Society of Friends, with the co-operation of others, began to take steps to relieve some of the distress that was immediately felt among the thousands of Germans, Austrians, and Hungarians who were then in England.